

City Council Meeting Minutes

**August 15, 2017
City Hall, Council Chambers
749 Main Street
7:00 PM**

Call to Order – Mayor Muckle called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call was taken and the following members were present:

City Council: ***Mayor Robert Muckle
Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Lipton
Councilmember Jay Keany (arrived 7:02 pm)
Councilmember Chris Leh
Councilmember Susan Loo
Councilmember Dennis Maloney
Councilmember Ashley Stolzmann***

Staff Present: ***Heather Balser, Interim City Manager
Kevin Watson, Finance Director
Kurt Kowar, Director of Public Works
Joe Stevens, Director of Parks & Recreation
Rob Zuccaro, Director of Planning & Building Safety
Lisa Ritchie, Associate Planner
Lauren Trice, Associate Planner
Cory Peterson, Water Resources Engineer
Meredyth Muth, City Clerk***

Others Present: ***Sam Light, City Attorney***

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All rose for the pledge of allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Muckle called for changes to the agenda and hearing none, moved to approve the agenda, seconded by Councilmember Leh. All were in favor. Absent: Keany

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Deb Fahey, 1118 West Enclave Circle, representing the Seniors of Louisville, stated the Seniors of Louisville and its advisory board will be dissolving effective 12/31/17. The Board feels the assistance they have been providing to seniors can be effectively met in other ways. All funds will be dispersed following IRS regulations and the Board's bylaws. We hope the seniors in Louisville will contact the Community Resources Coordinator at the Louisville Senior Center for assistance. She thanked all of the businesses and individuals who have supported the Board over the years.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: Mayor Muckle moved to approve the consent agenda, seconded by Councilmember Stolzmann. All were in favor.

- A. *Approval of Bills***
- B. *Approval of Minutes: July 31, 2017; August 1, 2017***
- C. *Approval of Resolution No. 46, Series 2017 – A Resolution Approving an Amended Agreement with the Urban Drainage and Flood Control District (UDCFD) for the Design and Construction of the BNSF Railroad Underpass Project***
- D. *Approve Contract between the City of Louisville and Spiegel Industrial LLC for Water Treatment Plant Facility Painting***
- E. *Approve Contract between the City of Louisville and SM&RC Structural Engineers Inc. for the Louisville Pipeline Control Vault Design***
- F. *Approve Contract between the City of Louisville and JVA Inc. for the Louisville Lateral Piping Design***
- G. *Approve 2017 Street Improvement Contracts***
 - 1. *Award 2017 Crackseal Project to CKC Asphalt***
 - 2. *Approve Change Order #1 with Noraa Concrete for the 2017 Concrete Replacement***
 - 3. *Approve Change Order #1 with Asphalt Specialties for the 2017 Asphalt Reconstruction Project***
- H. *Approval of September 5 Start Time at 6:00 PM for Executive Session***
- I. *Approval of a Special Meeting on Tuesday, August 29, 2017 at 7:00 PM***

COUNCIL INFORMATIONAL COMMENTS ON PERTINENT ITEMS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Councilmember Stolzmann thanked the Seniors of Louisville for their years of service to the community.

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

Interim City Manager Balser reminded everyone of the Recreation/Senior Center and Memory Square expansion groundbreaking to be held August 18.

REGULAR BUSINESS

**ORDINANCE NO. 1745, SERIES 2017 – AN EMERGENCY ORDINANCE
APPROVING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT AMONG THE CITY OF
LOUISVILLE, CITY OF LAFAYETTE AND COUNTY OF BOULDER CONCERNING
THE PURCHASE OF THE MAYHOFFER FARM OPEN SPACE PROPERTY AND, IN
CONNECTION THEREWITH, AUTHORIZING THE PAYMENT OF CITY MONEYS
FOR THE ACQUISITION OF A FEE TITLE INTEREST IN AND RECIPROCAL
CONSERVATION EASEMENTS OVER THE PROPERTY FOR OPEN SPACE
PURPOSES, AND APPROVING AND AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL INSTRUMENTS
AND ACTIONS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH – *Emergency Ordinance – Public
Hearing – 1st and Final Reading***

Mayor Muckle introduced the ordinance. Attorney Light read the title of the ordinance and noted this is an emergency ordinance. This will be the public hearing and the first and final reading of the ordinance.

Mayor Muckle opened the public hearing. He noted this is being handled as an emergency ordinance so the sellers can close the sale by the end of the month. He added the purchase of this property has been the City's highest open space priority for many years; the current negotiations have been underway for three years. The ordinance will secure Louisville's interests in the property, the price, and the conservation easements in preparation for the purchase. The purchase contract is under negotiation and this ordinance gives the Mayor the authority to approve a purchase contract as long as it doesn't change substantially; the purchase contract will not come for Council approval separately as long as there are no substantial changes.

Interim City Manager Balser stated Boulder County will be entering into a purchase agreement for 165 acres of the Mayhoffer Farm property, located at the intersection of South 95th Street and Empire Road, along with the associated water and mineral rights.

The intergovernmental agreement (IGA) sets out a Louisville payment of just over \$2M of the approximately \$8.225M purchase price for the acquisition of fee title interest in and reciprocal conservation easements over the property and other associated interests. The County will pay 50% of the purchase price and Louisville and Lafayette are paying 25% each.

She noted there will be two conservation easements over two residential lots totaling 19.88 acres and one restrictive covenant over another residential lot totaling 14.29 acres, to be administered by Boulder County (the total property is approximately 199.48 acres). The easements will limit the size of the principal and accessory structures on these lots. The documents also require the preservation of certain historic buildings and prohibit the future subdivision or annexation of these lots.

Louisville will also obtain from the owner a right of refusal affecting the “Centennial House Lot.” Under this agreement, the City would have the second right to purchase the lot if Leannah Mayhoffer Baron chooses not to exercise a first right to acquire the lot.

The acquisition includes the mineral rights under the entire 200 acres. The transaction would prohibit mineral extraction on the property. After the purchase, the County will manage the open space on behalf of the three parties.

Staff recommends the approval of the ordinance and granting the Mayor the authority to execute the IGA on behalf of the City Council and further to negotiate revisions to the IGA as the Mayor determines necessary or in the best interests of the City or appropriate to effect the closing on the property.

Interim City Manager Balser thanked Boulder County staff, the Mayhoffer Family, Attorney Light, and the Public Works staff for their work on this.

Mayor Muckle asked for Public Comments.

Jean Morgan, 1301 Spruce Street, urged a yes vote for this purchase to maintain this as a great entrance to Louisville from the East.

John Leary, 1116 Lafarge Avenue, stated many others need to be thanked for this purchase as it completes the buffer with Lafayette. He reviewed some of the history of the property including attempts to rezone many properties for residential building that are now open space. He noted the legal issues and history of open space discussions in the 1970s and 1980s and the long-term resident support for the purchase/annexation of open space around Louisville.

Matt Jones, 265 Dahlia Drive, stated this is a great purchase, it is a buffer, it is agriculture land, and is a riparian area on the Coal Creek Corridor. He noted the conservation easement does not say anything about restoration of the creek corridor. He would recommend adding that to the conservation easement if possible.

Interim City Manager Balser noted Boulder County has already approved the IGA and Lafayette is considering it this evening.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton noted the Open Space Board is genuinely excited by this purchase. It will be a crown jewel in our open space lands. He thanked Boulder County and Lafayette for their work and collaboration. He congratulated staff for this purchase. He thanked the Mayhoffer family for their willingness to support this agreement.

Councilmember Stolzmann thanked the citizens of Louisville, Lafayette and Boulder County for their continued support of open space and their willingness to tax themselves for purchases like this. She also thanked the Mayhoffers for their stewardship of the

farm over the years and for working with us to allow the purchase of the land. She also thanked the staff and elected officials of Louisville, Lafayette, and Boulder County.

Councilmember Leh added his voice to the thank yous for all the parties involved including the Mayhoffers, staff, previous City Councils, and the County. He noted he has gotten questions about if there will be any extraction of minerals on the property and he noted it will not be allowed with the implementation of this easement.

Councilmember Maloney also thanked the many players, specifically staff and the previous City Manager for all of his efforts, as well as Boulder County and Lafayette.

David Carter, 874 West Willow Court, stated he is a friend of the Mayhoffer's; he urged a yes vote. He stated Jane Mayhoffer is in support of this and the family does want this sale. There are still issues to work out, including the restrictions on the homes in the conservation easement, the number of animals allowed on the property, and water rights. He noted the Mayhoffer's want to negotiate the mineral rights in finer detail. He asked if the Council has any sway on the County on these issues the Mayhoffer's would appreciate it.

Mayor Muckle closed the public hearing.

Mayor Muckle also thanked Louisville staff for their work on this as well as County staff. It has been a long negotiation and our partners and the Mayhoffers are working on finishing the details by the end of August. He thanked the residents who have taxed themselves over the years to allow for the purchases of open space.

Mayor Muckle moved to approve Ordinance 1745, Series 2017; Mayor Pro Tem Lipton seconded the motion.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

RESOLUTION NO. 38, SERIES 2017 – A RESOLUTION APPROVING A PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) AMENDMENT TO ALLOW FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A CONNECTION BETWEEN UNIT A & UNIT B AND AN EXTENSION OF THE APPROVED PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT FOR THREE YEARS AT 931 MAIN STREET *(Continued from 07/18/2017)*

Planner Trice gave the staff presentation. She stated this was continued from the July 18 meeting. Since that time, staff has met with the applicant twice to work on providing direction; however the tap fee issue has not been resolved. Staff recommends approval of the PUD and the PUD extension. Staff will continue to work with the applicant at an administrative level to resolve the tap fee issue.

Staff recommends the approval of the PUD and the PUD extension with the condition that the applicant remove the City Utility Table and footnote on the Utility Plan and Note

Number One on the Utility Plan shall be amended to read “Existing water tap and meter service to the property are to remain.”

Applicant Presentation: Peter Stewart, 1132 Jefferson Avenue, Stewart Architecture, stated this has been a difficult and frustrating process due to the lack of a clear definition of what a commercial premise is. He stated his understanding that the approval of a PUD is to provide the applicant assurances that if the proposed PUD is approved the applicant can proceed with technical drawings required for a building permit. As long as all those conditions are met the City will issue a building permit. Likewise the City is assured the approved design will be built. We have met with staff over the last few weeks. At the end of the process staff provided a summary letter that stated staff has the option to require something different at the time of permitting even with the approved PUD.

Over the course of the project all of the planning and building staff has changed. New planners indicated the existing documentation was not sufficient and additional plans were required. This requirement made financing unfeasible.

Stewart stated that later he was told the addition needs to be physically attached to the building if we wanted to meet the definition of premise; otherwise it will be two premises and require two taps. Given that, the project was redesigned and staff received a new concept plan. However, staff now told us additional area needs to be enclosed; we redesigned again and everyone seemed to accept it. We requested this be processed administratively to save time, but staff declined to do so and additional time was required to process the application which is why the PUD extension is needed.

Public Works told us if the addition is attached it will be a single premise and so we designed and submitted it that way. We designed it to meet best practices for additions to historic buildings. However, Public Works stated it looked too much like two buildings not one. We are still being told it is two premises but don't understand why that determination was made.

Stewart stated that more recently staff has placed additional conditions for it to be considered a single premise. He stated he feels the additional requirements being imposed on this application are not applied to other applicants. He stated he expects all applicants to be treated equally. He thinks the solution they proposed works, meets the design guidelines and best practices for historic buildings, meets the goals of the applicant and meets the criteria for a commercial single premise.

Stewart requested Council approve the amendment and the PUD extension without the condition staff is recommending. With this assurance the applicant can proceed with technical drawings. Staff has stated tap fees are determined at permitting because they are determined by final engineering plans. We are not requesting tap fee determination at this time, but we are requesting a determination for building classification. We want these PUD documents to clearly specify the number of commercial premises proposed.

We request approval of: the site plan as presented, the PUD amendment, the utility plan for one water tap, and the notes showing the existing water tap will be utilized to serve the new addition.

Public Comments

John Leary, 1116 Lafarge Avenue, stated that in 2008 a legal opinion was written for the City about the design guidelines. It's clear the design guidelines are part of our ordinances and are law. He stated that this site plan should be given more weight than arbitrary standards.

Council Comments

Councilmember Keany asked staff why they asked for the removal of the demising walls to make it one premise.

Director Kowar stated that often what looks like one building in a strip mall is actually multiple buildings with many separate taps. This is the same interpretation. He stated the question is really what is the minimum threshold to be considered one building. He stated this design is on the edge of what could be considered one or two buildings so staff has looked at what we have done historically in these situations and that is consider it two premises.

Director Zucarro stated this is a PUD application and there are PUD criteria to be considered. The definition of a premise is not a part of this PUD discussion. Discussion of taps is not appropriate in a zoning document.

Councilmember Keany stated that in Utility Committee meetings he had been told if the buildings were attached one tap was required. The applicant made it one structure to preserve the front building, so why are we still calling this two buildings? There is no clear path forward for the applicant and the applicant has no assurance they will only be charged one tap fee at permitting. He stated he is extremely frustrated and it seems the City is going out of the way to be difficult with the applicant.

Attorney Light noted that the Council has to operate within the current ordinances. Currently, Title 17 is not designed to address the tap fee issue. That could be changed later, but at this time the current ordinances apply. He stated Title 13 says two or more premises may not be served by one tap. The PUD does allow the framework for what may be built under the PUD, but manner and method of construction matters to the evaluation of what constitutes a premise. Something short of full construction drawings may allow for a determination, but the Public Works Department does not yet have drawings that show the manner and method of construction. Without those a determination cannot be made. Jurisdictionally, this is how these determinations are made under the current code. Council can change those later if they choose to. This PUD cannot give a "no" or a "yes" as to what constitutes a premise.

Councilmember Maloney stated he sees two buildings in these drawings. How do we have clear definition on issues like this in the future? Attorney Light stated in this application, Council is not determining if this is one or two premises if you use the staff recommendation to remove the utility information. Regarding changing the existing rules, staff could come back with a proposed ordinance, independent of this decision, to address this for later applications. There are other ways to handle this, but none of them are perfect for all applications, but Council can consider that at a later date.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton agreed this is frustrating for the applicant. The tap fee structure for these types of things are not very scalable and Council has asked staff to look into amending this in general. However, he does understand this is a PUD process for this application, and the premise issue needs to be handled separately. Council can look at the water tap issues as a whole later to make it more refined and scalable.

Councilmember Keany stated he understands this is a PUD application, but was frustrated staff could not give the applicant a clear path to what would be considered a single premise. Is there nothing in this site plan that could make it a single building?

Councilmember Loo stated staff is doing this correctly. They can't determine the tap fee until they have final engineering drawings with full details. Staff can't make a decision without that. She stated Council should not be figuring out the tap fee; that is the job of staff when they have detailed information.

Mayor Muckle stated he would like to allow this property owner to move forward. He suggested approval of the PUD but include a note in the record that we appreciate the preservation of the front of the building; it is a good addition following the downtown design guidelines and good preservation, that should be recognized.

Councilmember Loo asked if the building was landmarked. Director Zucarro stated it is not. Councilmember Loo stated we give incentives to buildings that are landmarked, but his building is not. She noted there is the possibility this could be a bigger commercial space at a later date. She agreed with Councilmember Maloney it looks like two buildings. She does not support Mayor Muckle's note.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated the application meets the PUD criteria, is consistent with the zoning code, and she supports approval of the PUD. She noted a legislative discussion about the premise determination issue should be added to a future agenda. This is not a straight forward issue. We need to think deliberately how a change to the code affects many situations and the entire water system. Changes should not be discussed as they relate to this particular application. It is not appropriate to discuss what we should do legislatively as it relates to this PUD application. She supports the staff recommendation.

Councilmember Keany stated any future changes to the building use will affect the tap fee and the tap may need to be increased at a later time if required. The issue is that the applicant has been told they must purchase two taps rather than upsize the one tap. He stated the applicant may be willing to upsize the existing tap rather than have to pay for a separate tap. If a building use changes the tap fee can be recalculated at that time. That discussion is separate from the PUD.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked what the appeal process is for the tap size issue. Attorney Light stated there is no administrative appeal process but the applicant can pay the fees under protest and consider seeking judicial relief.

Councilmember Leh agreed with Councilmember Stolzmann that the criteria have been met for the PUD. Other than that, the Council does not have the ability to address the tap fee issue.

Mayor Muckle moved to approve Resolution No. 38, Series 2017 with the condition proposed by staff to remove the language from the note. He added his statement that he feels this is an appropriate addition to a historical building. Councilmember Maloney seconded the motion.

Voice vote: all in favor.

RESOLUTION NO. 47, SERIES 2017 – A RESOLUTION TO APPROVE A FINAL PLAT, A FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD) AND A SPECIAL REVIEW USE TO ALLOW DEVELOPMENT OF A NEW PUMP STATION AT THE SID COPELAND WATER TREATMENT PLANT

Mayor Muckle introduced the resolution.

Planner Ritchie gave the staff presentation stating this is an application for a final plat, a final PUD, and Special Review Use to allow additional improvements, specifically a new high zone/mid zone pump station at the Sid Copeland Water Treatment Plant. She added all public notice requirements have been met. She showed the location of the property on Washington Avenue and showed the location of the proposed new pump station. It includes a 1350 s.f. building that is recessed into the hillside. The architecture will match the brick of the existing building on site.

At the planning commission hearing the neighbors expressed concern the proposed trees to screen the new structure may obstruct their view. Public Works staff has worked with Parks to alter the tree species to avoid any obstruction.

Staff recommends approval of the plat, PUD, and Special Review Use.

Cory Peterson, Public Works, noted the existing pump station is about 30 years old and this plan allows building the new one while still using the old one so there is no interruption in water service.

Jennifer Robertson, 513 West Cedar Place, stated her understanding that the existing pumps have a greater capacity than is currently used. She asked why staff can't use that capacity rather than build a new station.

Peterson stated the existing station has six pumps, but only three are operational. The last failure was two months ago. Staff has determined it is not feasible to continue to fix the existing station and a new one is needed.

Tom Robertson, 513 West Cedar, asked what is to become of the old pump station.

Peterson stated the existing one will stay in place but the interior will be demolished. The building may be repurposed in the future if additional space is needed for future drying beds or another facility is needed.

Mayor Muckle stated the Utility Committee reviewed this and it has been in the CIP plan for many years. It is important to the functionality of the water system in the high and mid zones. He appreciates staff is able to maintain water service while building a new pump station. Providing water to residents is one of our core jobs.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she finds all the criteria are met.

Councilmember Keany agreed the Utility Committee recommends these upgrades. It improves our water system reliability. It is a life safety issue and needs to be addressed.

Councilmember Loo moved to approve Resolution 47, Series 2017; Mayor Muckle seconded the motion.

Voice vote: all in favor.

RESOLUTION NO. 48, SERIES 2017 – A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE 2017 BUDGET BY AMENDING APPROPRIATIONS IN THE WATER UTILITY FUND – PUBLIC HEARING (advertised *Daily Camera* 08/11/17)

Mayor Muckle introduced the item and opened the public hearing. Director Watson noted this amendment increases appropriations in the Water Fund to complete various maintenance projects. It has been discussed by the Finance and the Utility Committees and they both recommend approval.

Public Comments – None.

Councilmember Loo stated her support for completing these maintenance items.

Councilmember Loo moved to approve Resolution No. 48, Series 2017; Councilmember Keany seconded the motion.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated her support for the motion and added it is hard to make long-range plans for capital and maintenance so major adjustments like this aren't needed in the future. She would like staff to prepare a long-range plan for water rates and a better understanding of what is driving the rate increases. She would like more information as to why the rates have gone up so much in the last few years. We need more long-range planning for preventative maintenance.

Vote: Motion carried by unanimous roll call vote.

**RESOLUTION NO. 49, SERIES 2017 – A RESOLUTION SETTING REVISED
INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER SURCHARGE RATES FOR THE CITY OF
LOUISVILLE, COLORADO**

Mayor Muckle introduced the item. Director Kowar stated this is consideration of an increase to the wastewater surcharge fees. As a part of our environmental permit for the wastewater plant there is an Industrial Pretreatment Program (IPP) that sets discharge limits for large users that may impact our wastewater treatment plant. We set rates in coordination with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and then we uphold those rates through the IPP. What is before you are the fines we charge people who discharge a high amount of solids or what are called "biological oxygen demand" and oil and grease into our system. It was last updated in 1992. Staff recommends increasing the fines from 25 cents to 58 cents.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked why the Utility Committee had not reviewed this. Director Kowar stated it is a routine item and staff felt it didn't need additional review.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated this is a doubling of the fee and we don't know what the impact is; it might be a large impact to an industrial user. Director Kowar noted the fiscal impact is an increase of about \$15,000 in revenue to the City. He noted that if an industrial user meets all of the discharge rules, they won't get charged anything.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton stated he simply would like this to be handled procedurally with a review from the Utility Committee.

Councilmember Loo asked if industrial users had been notified of the proposed change. Director Kowar stated notification had not been made; he noted only a handful of users will be affected. This is a fine, not a use charge, and is used to recoup the cost of treating the extra material in our wastewater system. Councilmember Loo noted those who might be affected should have been told this increase was under discussion so they could attend the meeting to state their concerns if they had any.

Councilmember Stolzmann stated it is not uncommon for fees to be charged for treating this effluent and this does affect the cost of treating wastewater. She also felt the Utility Committee should have reviewed this. She agreed users should have been notified of the proposed change. She noted this doesn't seem like a high cost to those who pretreat their waste and this encourages them to make sure their pretreatment is effective.

Councilmember Maloney noted he is in agreement with the concept, however, he stated this should be handled in November when all fees are reviewed.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton agreed this should be reviewed with the rest of the fees in the November process.

Mayor Muckle agreed it should be a part of the annual fee review, but this is important to the system running and there is no reason to wait and bring this back in November. He asked this be included in the annual fee review in future years.

Mayor Muckle moved to approve Resolution No. 49, Series 2017; Councilmember Stolzmann seconded the motion

Roll call vote: Motion passed (**summary:** Yes = 5, No = 2, Abstain = 0).

Yes: Council Member Stolzmann, Council Member Leh, Council Member Loo, Mayor Muckle, Council Member Keany.

No: Mayor Pro Tem Lipton, Council Member Maloney.

**FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT TO ALLOW THE CONSTRUCTION OF
THREE BUILDINGS CONTAINING A TOTAL OF 36,600 SQUARE FEET WITH 32
CONDOMINIUM STORAGE UNITS AND A CLUBHOUSE AT 745 S. PIERCE
AVENUE (HEARING TO BE VACATED – APPLICANT HAS WITHDRAWN
APPLICATION)**

Director Zucarro stated this was scheduled for public hearing this evening, but more time is needed with the application. Rather than continue to a new date, the applicant has asked to vacate the hearing and it will come back when the application is ready.

Mayor Muckle moved to vacate the consideration of the final planned unit development plan for 745 South Pierce; Councilmember Stolzmann seconded the motion.

Voice vote: all in favor.

City Attorney Light noted that when the item comes back it will be noticed appropriately.

CITY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

City Attorney Light noted that on September 5 there will be an executive session to cover property matters and perhaps a pending litigation item.

He will be giving the Council an open government training on August 22.

He added that August 28 is the last day for candidate affidavits to be filed with the City Clerk for anyone who wants to run for City Council.

**COUNCIL COMMENTS, COMMITTEE REPORTS, AND IDENTIFICATION OF
FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Councilmember Stolzmann stated she sent everyone the Library Strategic Plan and Work Plan for 2018 and could answer questions anyone has.

Mayor Pro Tem Lipton asked the Council to spend time at a subsequent meeting on the advanced agenda looking at the items for the remainder of the calendar year.

Councilmember Leh suggested next year the Council consider creating a new City Senior Commission now that the Seniors of Louisville are dissolving.

Mayor Muckle thanked all volunteers and staff for the great Street Faire season.

ADJOURN

Members adjourned the meeting at 8:55 pm.

Robert P. Muckle, Mayor

Meredyth Muth, City Clerk